

REMARKS

Claims 16, 17, 19-21 and 30-42 were pending in the application. Claims 16 and 17 have been amended. Accordingly, after the amendments presented herein have been entered, claims 16, 17, 19-21 and 30-42 will remain pending in the instant application. *No new matter has been added.*

Support for the amendments to claims 16 and 17 can be found throughout the specification and claims as originally filed.

Cancellation of and/or amendment to the claims should in no way be construed as an acquiescence to any of the Examiner's rejections. The cancellation of and/or amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the above-identified application.

Withdrawal of Rejections

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 16-17, 19-21, and 30-42 for allegedly lacking enablement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-17, 19-21, and 30-42 for allegedly lacking written description under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Rejection of Claims 16-17, 19-21 and 30-42 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 16-17, 19-21, and 30-42 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of which the Applicants regard as the invention.

Particularly the Examiner states:

“Claim 16 recites the limitation “candidate agent” and “agent “in subsection (b). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, because the claim recites “candidate bioactive agent” in subsection (a). Claim 17 also recites “candidate agent” instead of “candidate bioactive agent”, for which there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 16 from which claim 17 depends. Claim 19-21, 30-42 are rejected in so far as they depend on the recitation in claims 16 and 17 of “candidate agent.”

Applicants have amended the wording of claims 16 and 17 to address the issues of antecedent basis pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, “candidate agent” and “agent” recited in claim 16, subsection (b), have been amended to recite “candidate bioactive agent.” The recitation of “candidate agent” in claim 17 has also been amended to recite “candidate bioactive agent.”


The rejection of claims 16 and 17 have become moot because of Applicants’ amendments. The rejections of claims 19-21, 30-42, depending from claims 16 and/or 17, are also made moot by the amendments.

CONCLUSION

If a telephone conversation with Applicants' Attorney would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is urged to call the undersigned at (617) 227-7400.

Respectfully submitted,

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP

By: 
DeAnn F. Smith, Esq.
Registration No 38, 683
Attorney for Applicants

28 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 227-7400

Dated: March 2, 2005